

## MR. CLIFFORD OF MAINE,

ON THE

## GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1840.

*In the House of Representatives, April 24, 1840—In Committee of the Whole, on the General Appropriation bill.*

Mr. CLIFFORD desired to make a few remarks chiefly in reply to what had been said by others, and consequently not immediately applicable to the subject before the committee. He then spoke in substance as follows: It would have been more gratifying to me, if this debate had been confined to the usual range of parliamentary discussion, embracing the various propositions contained in the bill under consideration, and excluding a great variety of party topics that have been introduced, well calculated to protract the session, and delay the public business, without producing any corresponding benefit. The history of this session alone is amply sufficient to satisfy every reflecting mind, that there must be some limitation to debate in a deliberative body, so numerous as the House of Representatives, to facilitate the progress of business, and to preserve order and decorum among its members; and that the only practicable mode of doing this, is by a careful observance of the rules of the House, which should always be enforced, when occasion requires, to promote these desirable objects. These remarks are not made in any spirit of complaint towards the Chair, for it is not unknown to me that every effort to restrain irregular debate has been met from certain quarters with a determined resistance or a chilling support, and the best reason I have heard assigned for it, is the one given by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wise, that "latitude in debate is the life of the Opposition;" and if so, no one can feel less inclined than myself, especially after that frank avowal, to incur the charge of attempting or desiring to destroy the vital principle of a great and powerful party. If latitude in debate is desired, so let it be, with this understanding, that those who seek to introduce it shall have the responsibility. If the Democratic party cannot stand upon a full discussion, let it fall; but

it cannot be expected that the discussion will be confined to one side. It is not my habit to wander from the question, unless it becomes necessary to do so as a matter of defence. If any apology is necessary on the present occasion, it will be found in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. SALTSONSTALL,] who went into an extended and ingenious argument, and, as I thought at the time, in defence of the Hartford Convention and of the principles and measures of the Federal party. Be that as it may, he now disclaims having done so. If his explanation is not now misapprehended, he then said, as a matter of expediency, he would not attempt their defence, though he admits that he participated in the proceedings which laid the foundation for the convention. His precise language is of no importance. I cheerfully accept the explanation. But, in other respects, I cannot be mistaken. The gentleman himself will not deny that he assured the House and the country that the members of that convention had been censured unjustly; that, during an angry contest for certain great constitutional principles, their designs had been misunderstood, and that their motives had been misrepresented, and that he repudiated the idea that the Federal party ever contemplated the dissolution of the Union. He seems to think it unkind on the part of his colleague to rake up these old affairs, and says he has scarcely thought of them for the last twenty years, which, to say the least of it, is a little remarkable; for if I am not greatly deceived, he has been intimately connected with the Federal party in Massachusetts from 1813 to the present time, advocating the same principles, and maintaining the same political associations. By the way of remembrance, in the course of my remarks, I will endeavor to refresh his recollection upon certain matters of history, which, to my mind, afford the most conclusive evidence that certain leaders of that party, during the last war with Great Britain, and for several

years prior, covering the period from 1800 to the treaty of peace in 1814, were guilty of unceasing efforts to excite the people of New England to open rebellion and resistance of the Federal Government, and actually plotted a dissolution of the Union and the establishment of a Northern confederacy under the auspices of British protection; and that in all this they were actuated by that inordinate thirst for power and inveterate hatred of free principles, which are the essential elements of Federalism itself. But as I propose to speak of the principles and measures of the two great political parties which have existed in this country from the foundation of the Government to the present time, and which, from the very nature of our institutions and the structure of the social order itself, it is reasonable to believe, will ever continue to exist, at least till "the lion and the lamb shall lie down together," I will touch upon those matters in the order of events in which they occurred. The first organization of parties took place during the latter part of General Washington's administration, who had been twice elected to the Chief Magistracy of the nation by the spontaneous and unanimous suffrages of the people, and, in spite of the radical and irreconcilable differences of opinion, which are known to have existed among the leading minds of that eventful period, continued to enjoy, to the very close of his last term, the uninterrupted confidence of all classes of men. In their origin, these differences of opinion involved nearly opposite views as to the model and form of Government which the exigencies of the time demanded, with reference to its operation upon the frame and structure of society, and its tendency to promote the individual happiness and prosperity of the people, and, at the same time, to afford sufficient strength and efficiency to insure domestic tranquillity, and to provide for the common defence. The natural tendency of these conflicting views, after the adoption of the Constitution, led their respective adherents to widely different rules of interpretation of the instrument itself, in the application of it to the purposes for which it had been formed. This gave rise to party organization, which, with slight modifications and occasional interruptions, has continued to this day. Far be it from me to insinuate that there was any want of patriotic feeling, or of upright intention, in the conduct of any member of the convention that framed the Constitution; and candor will oblige me to admit, that it is by no means certain that much of the distrust of the virtue and intelligence of the people, which all must admit was evinced in that assembly by a portion of its most efficient members, may not be traced to causes long since removed by the light of experience, and yet while they existed, affording at least strong palliation for the misconceptions which they occasioned. However this may be, it is nevertheless true, that the master spirit and father of Federalism, Alexander Hamilton, was strongly inclined to the British system of Government, and indeed its open advocate for reasons entirely consistent with the purity of motive which has usually been ascribed to him; for it has been said that he verily believed it "to form the best model the world ever produced," and if so, no one will censure his motives, though I imagine

few among us can be found, that dare vindicate his principles, however similar their own may be in effect. He distrusted the capacity of the people for self-government, and believed in the necessity of a strong Executive power to control what he called "the turbulence of Democracy;" and it was the Executive feature of the British system, above all others, that excited his admiration, as being above the reach of improvement. Observe his remarks:

"See the excellence of the British Executive: he is placed above temptation. Nothing short of such an Executive (a King) can be efficient. I confess the plan of Government which I propose is very remote from the idea of the people. Nothing but a permanent body [of life legislators] can check the imprudence of the Democracy. The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge or determine right; and, again, all political communities ought to be divided into the few and the many; the first are the rich and well born, the other the mass of the people."

The same want of confidence in the sovereign voice of the people to institute and uphold the machinery of Government through the medium of their constituted agents, is discoverable throughout his public career. It is impossible to misunderstand the scope and bearing of his remarks against the weakness and instability of Republican institutions. Upon this point, as upon all others, he descanted with great freedom and boldness. He undertook to demonstrate from experience that their inevitable tendency would lead to anarchy and civil commotion, from which he argued their inefficiency to promote the durable happiness and prosperity of a great and rising people.

"I despair that any Republican form of Government can remove the difficulties that Greece and Rome encountered. I have well considered the subject, and am well convinced that no amendment of the articles of confederation can answer the purposes of a good Government, so long as the State Governments do in any shape exist."

The more recent publication of his speech varies the language, but does not change the sense. He is made to say, that—

"This view of the subject almost led him to despair that a Republican Government could be established over so great an extent. He was sensible, at the same time, that it would be unwise to propose one of any other form. In his private opinion, he had no scruple in declaring, supported as he was by so many of the wise and the good, that the British Government was the best in the world, and that he doubted whether any thing short of it would do in America. The House of Lords is a most noble institution. Having nothing to hope for by a change, and a sufficient interest, by means of their property, in being faithful to the national interest, they form a permanent barrier against every pernicious innovation, whether attempted on the part of the Crown or of the Commons. No temporary Senate will have firmness enough to answer the purpose."

Deriving his opinions from the study of the monarchies of Europe, and especially of England, where the voice of the people had been little considered, and, consequently, was greatly undervalued, he was thoroughly persuaded that nothing short of a President and Senate for life, or during good behavior, which, for all practical purposes, is the same thing, could ever obviate the defects, or, to any extent, supply the deficiencies which experience had demonstrated to be inherent in the articles of Confederation. His plan of Government, as it has been called, was the third in the order of time that was presented to the convention. It was on this occasion that he expressed his opinions with so much freedom, as well as with masterly ability; and throughout his life he evinced one characteristic which does not belong to Federalism of modern date: he spurned disguise, and always evinced a



willingness to present to his opponents a clear and distinct issue. He despised truckling and hypocrisy, and never sought to change his name or conceal his principles. He was bitterly opposed to the State Governments, and he did not hesitate to avow that hostility on every suitable occasion. In speaking of the different propositions that had preceded his own, he remarked "that the States, by either, will have the means to counteract the General Government. They have their State judges and militia all combined to oppose a National Government."

"Either plan is, therefore, precarious. The National Government cannot long exist, when opposed by such a weighty rival." While it is no part of my intention to derogate, in the slightest degree, from the merit of the honorable dead, I beg leave to say, what few will deny who have any regard to truth; that the sentiments so freely advanced by Hamilton are known to have been entertained—in some instances, perhaps, with slight modifications—by very many of the leaders of the Federal party, at the period of the adoption of the Constitution; and that they were openly acknowledged by the more honest and candid, until their defeat, in 1800, in the election of Mr. Jefferson. If there was any concealment of their disbelief in the stability of a Republican form of Government, or of their want of confidence in the capacity of the people to govern themselves, before that time, it is unknown to me. It was not until it was ascertained that the views and feelings of a great majority of the people were averse to such principles, and that those who entertained them would be excluded from any participation in the public councils of the nation, that the subtleties and disguises of the present time began to be introduced. Examine the speech of Mr. Morris: it is no less explicit, and equally candid and free of disguise. "The second branch of the Legislature ought to be composed of men of great and established property—an aristocracy! men who, from pride, support permanency. To make them completely independent, (of the people,) they must be chosen for life. Such an aristocratic body would keep down the turbulence of Democracy."

Similar views were taken by Mr. Read, another distinguished Federalist in that convention. He maintained that a State Government is incompatible with a General Government, and the elder Adams, though not in the convention, was subsequently supported by that party for the Presidency, "by his being likely to unite the votes of New England, by his favor with the English party, from his speculative views concerning the British constitution;" and the remark has been frequently ascribed to him, that it was the true policy of the common people to place the whole executive power in one man, though I have not been able to find the authority upon which the charge rests. The plan of Mr. Hamilton, to which I have adverted, will be found in the Madison Papers, recently published, from which I beg leave to read a few extracts:

"The Senate to consist of persons elected to serve during good behavior; their election, to be made by electors, chosen for that purpose by the people."

"The supreme executive authority of the United States to be vested in a governor; to be elected to serve during good beha-

vior; the election to be made by electors, chosen by the people in the election districts. The authority and functions of the executive to be as follows: to have a negative on all laws about to be passed, and the execution of all laws passed."

But it is useless to multiply extracts to prove what is very generally acknowledged, by those who have taken the trouble to investigate, and have the honesty to admit, the truth, that very many of the old Federalists were openly in favor of a system of Government not very different from that of the mother country, which, to use the language of the elder Adams, they regarded as "the most stupendous fabric of human wisdom." In treating of the same subject, the late Matthew Carey remarks, "that the Federal party made every possible exertion to increase the energy and add to the authority of the General Government, and to endow it with powers at the expense of the State Governments and the people. Bearing strongly in mind the disorders and convulsions of some of the ill balanced Republics of Greece and Italy, their sole object of dread appeared to be the inroads of anarchy; and as mankind too generally find it difficult to steer the middle course, their apprehensions of the Scylla of anarchy effectually blinded them to the Charybdis of despotism. Had they possessed a complete ascendancy in the convention, it is possible they would have fallen into the opposite extreme to that which decided the tenor of the Constitution. This party was divided among themselves; a small, but very active, division were monarchists, and utterly disbelieved in the efficacy or security of a Republican form of Government, especially in a territory so extensive as that of the United States, embracing so numerous a population as were to be taken into the account at no distant period."

It is a well-known fact that needs no confirmation, that the present Constitution was more the result of compromise, induced by the exigencies of the country at the period of its formation, and dictated by a spirit of conciliation and conscientious obedience to the will of the majority, which characterized the conduct of its framers at every stage of their proceedings, than the exponent of the views of either of the two parties that were represented in that convention. The mass of the people felt deeply the imperfections of the articles of confederation, and ardently wished for such alterations as would relieve them of the evils which they had experienced in consequence of them; but there was a wide diversity of opinion as to the character of the alterations necessary to be made to attain that object. On the 17th of September, 1787, the present draft was agreed to, and immediately transmitted to Congress "in a letter subscribed by the President, in which it was said to be the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of their political situation rendered indispensable." Immediately after its publication it was submitted by Congress to the several States for ratification. It is necessary to glance at the discussion that ensued, in order more fully to comprehend the aim and objects of parties, or the motive by which they were influenced at the time of its adoption. It is true that many of the Republicans opposed it, not because they were averse to a more perfect union of the States for

certain specified purposes, to regulate the commerce of the country, and to insure the common defence, but because, in some respects, its internal powers were more ample, and in others, less cautiously restricted, as they believed, than were consistent with the sovereignty of the States, or the liberty of the people. They were jealous of the extent of power conferred upon the Executive, as conceding too much to the known partialities of their opponents, and they criticized, with great severity, the omission to provide a bill of rights for the security of the citizen. It was this last objection that weighed so heavily on the mind of Mr. Jefferson, and it is no discredit to the soundness of his judgment, that the good sense of the people so far appreciated his opinions, as to supply the deficiency. On this point Mr. Jefferson remarks:

"Approved as much of the Constitution as most persons, and more of it was disapproved by my accuser than by me, and of its parts most vitally Republican. My objection to the Constitution was the want of a bill of rights—Colonel Hamilton's, that it wanted a king and a house of lords. The sense of America has approved my objection, and added the bill of rights, and not the king and lords."

Again, he denies that he was opposed to the payment of the public debt, and says:

"He wishes it paid to-morrow—Colonel Hamilton never; but always to remain in existence, for him to manage and corrupt the Legislature."

It is undeniably true, that some of the features of the instrument, which most excited the fears and jealousy of those that desired as far as possible to preserve the authority of the States, afforded the strongest inducements to their opponents to espouse its adoption, which they did, for the reasons assigned, as well as from the conviction arising from the fact, then made evident in the discussion that immediately followed its publication, that no nearer approach to that system of national power to which all their efforts had been directed with earnest solicitude, could ever receive the sanction of the mass of the people. The development of public sentiment on this point was so clear, that the most barefaced advocates of monarchy yielded to the demonstrations of the voice of the people, and advocated the adoption of the Constitution; and whatever may be thought of their motives, it must be confessed they contributed to a praiseworthy result. It cannot be necessary or useful to pursue that branch of the inquiry further. My object is accomplished if I have said enough to draw attention to the incipient causes which led to party division at the period of which I am speaking; and, if I am not mistaken, all who have examined the subject with the care which it deserves, will feel obliged to acknowledge that it took its rise in a radical and theoretical difference of opinion as to the first principle of Government itself, with reference to its tendency to promote the happiness and prosperity of those for whose benefit it is instituted. Let that be as it may, of this I am certain, that ever since the adoption of the Constitution, it has been the policy of the Federal party to obtain by construction, in every shape and form which human ingenuity can suggest, what they failed to secure after repeated attempts, by express grant.

The vagrant power to incorporate, which has so many advocates at this time in the ranks of the Opposition, though scarcely any two of them can agree upon its locality, was directly and solemnly

refused a place in the Constitution. It was several times considered, in one form or another; but, as often as it was proposed, it was promptly voted down by a large majority of the States. The reasons assigned for the refusal were, that the people in certain portions of the Confederacy were averse to a National Bank, and if the power to incorporate should be recommended, it would obviously include the right to charter a Bank, and that this would present an obstacle of a very dangerous character to the consummation of the general design. Thus it appears, at that early day, the people of this country were fully apprised of the dangerous influences and alarming tendency of a corporate institution in the bosom of a free Republic, to control its currency, and to mete out its favors or its curses as self-interest might render most expedient to its purpose. The people never dreamed, during the discussion that ensued, that any such power would be found lurking in the provisions of the instrument they were called upon to sanction by their suffrages. But no sooner was it adopted than the Federal party, true to their original design, claimed it by construction. The Democratic party denied it, and they deny it still. The opponents of this Administration, by whatever name they choose to call themselves, affirm it. This was the great point of division when party organization, in its more extended sense, took place at the close of Gen. Washington's administration with reference to the selection of his successor.

The objects of parties underwent no change, but the system of operation was necessarily varied to the altered circumstances with which they were surrounded; all acquiesced in the new Constitution, but their principles remained the same as before its adoption. It now became necessary to fix its interpretation. Here they divided. The one party desired to confine its application to the specified objects for which it had been created; the other was equally solicitous to extend its provisions by implication, to embrace the objects which they believed ought to have been included among its enumerated powers. The ostensible object of the latter, so far as any avowal of their intention was made, was to include the power to incorporate, with the view to the establishment of a National Bank. This has been a favorite object with the anti-Democratic party at every stage of our history, and through all the disguises of names and principles which have marked its career of wickedness and folly; and if I am not greatly deceived in the signs of the times, it is one of the leading motives to the desperate struggle for power and place now being made by a great and powerful party, under the assumed name of Whigs. On the 14th of December, 1790, the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to Congress a letter, accompanying his report of a plan of a National Bank. The report is full and elaborate, but I will not weary attention by reading more than a single passage: "It is to be considered that such a bank is not a mere matter of private property, but a political machine of the greatest importance to the State." It is manifest that the author of that paper looked upon a bank as the natural ally of the Executive, and as a valuable and necessary appendage of national power, calculated to give strength and vigor to the Federal



Administration, in all its internal operations and machinery. Undoubtedly it might be so, while its favor was conciliated, and the wishes of its owners and managers consulted. The principle of self interest would dictate so much of patriotism, and no more. The reason, however, that prompted its recommendation, was founded upon the expectation of its alliance with the Government. But experience has shown, beyond controversy, that, while such an institution may become a political machine, to sustain an administration of its choice, it is no less powerful in opposition to one that may incur its displeasure. That, in either event, it will be a political machine in the hands of its directors, and consequently irresponsible to the people of the country, needs no confirmation. But to mark the line of party division with more accuracy, it is necessary to pursue this subject further.

It soon became evident that the people, as well as the cabinet, were divided in opinion touching the constitutional power of Congress to charter such an institution. The President, in pursuance of a practice which then prevailed, required the members of his cabinet to submit their respective views in writing. As the opinions of Hamilton and Jefferson cover the whole ground, I will read from them. It is worthy of remark, that the former maintained the power to incorporate, in its broadest sense, without limitation, deriving it from every specified grant in the Constitution. Fearlessness was a prominent trait of his character, and, as I have already remarked, he spurned any disguise, and on this occasion broached the whole doctrine of construction, untinged with the concealment of after times; and throughout his whole public life, I believe, he adhered to it, and gave it a steady and firm support. It will appear that he claimed the right as an attribute of sovereignty itself, and after premising that it is the clause of incorporation which gives rise to objection, he remarks:

"Now it appears to the Secretary of the Treasury that this general principle is inherent in the very definition of Government, and essential to every step of the progress to be made by that of the United States; namely, that every power vested in a Government is in its nature sovereign, and includes, by force of the term, a right to employ all the means requisite, and fairly applicable to the attainment of the ends of such power, and which are not precluded by restrictions and exceptions specified in the Constitution, or not immoral, or not contrary to the essential ends of political society. The circumstances that the powers of sovereignty are, in this country, divided between the National and State Government, does not afford the distinction required."

"The power which can create the supreme law of the land in any case, is doubtless sovereign as to such case. This general and indisputable principle puts at once an end to the abstract question whether the United States have power to erect a corporation, that is to say, to give a legal and artificial capacity to one or more persons, distinct from the natural; for it is unquestionably incident to sovereign power to erect corporations, and, consequently, to that of the United States in relation to the objects entrusted to the management of the Government."

No one can fail to perceive that the opinion of Mr. Jefferson is equally explicit, and precisely the reverse, denying, in every respect, the premises and conclusions of the Secretary of the Treasury. He says: "I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground, that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or the people. To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around

the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power no longer susceptible of any definition. The incorporation of a bank and other powers assumed by this bill, have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution.

"I. They are not among the powers specially enumerated.

"II. Nor are they within either of the general phrases, which are the two following:

"1. To lay taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States; that is to say, to lay taxes for the purpose of providing for the general welfare; for the laying of taxes is the power, and the general welfare the purpose for which the power is to be exercised. They are not to lay taxes *ad libitum* for any purpose they please, but only to pay the debts or provide for the welfare of the Union.

"2. The second general phrase is to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the enumerated powers. But they can all be carried into execution without a bank. A bank therefore is not necessary, and consequently not authorized by this phrase."

To avoid being tedious, I must pass rapidly over the period that immediately followed the establishment of a National Bank. Suffice it to say, in the language of the historian of Washington, that "this measure made a deep impression on many members of the Legislature, and contributed not inconsiderably to the complete organization of these distinct and visible parties which, in their long and dubious conflict for power, have since shaken the United States to their centre." It has seemed to me proper to draw public attention to the source of party division; as, in the course of this debate, both sides have claimed to be Republicans, and all seem anxious to cast off the name of Federalist; and as names are subject to change at all times, the surest test is to look at the principles. The struggle that ensued, it must be admitted on all sides, was one for principle. The Bank, or Federal party, supported the elder Adams for reasons which I have before stated; the Democratic party supported Mr. Jefferson. The former succeeded by a majority of three votes. That Administration has been emphatically denominated "the reign of terror." The alien and sedition laws were among the tyrannical measures which served to awaken the people to a sense of the danger with which they were surrounded. The liberty of speech and the press was invaded, under the pretence of affording protection to public officers against the strictures of party, and the prevalent disposition to slander and decry the Government; rights heretofore held sacred were forgotten, like the dreams of the night, in the shameless prosecutions for alleged violations of this "gag law," and the most open and barefaced infractions of the social compact were perpetrated with impunity, until "all confidence was lost in the midst of fear and apprehension." Perhaps it is not going too far to say that these several measures were partly induced by, if not the necessary consequence of, the sympathies and attachments of the party that sustained them to a system of national power, in conformity with the Constitution and laws of Great Britain, which they had long desired to see esta-

blished in this country, and which excited so much of their admiration. The sedition law was carried into effect, and enforced in some instances with great severity.

The case of Matthew Lyon was one of peculiar aggravation, and, as a sample of the bitter persecutions under that odious law, deserves to be more fully considered. From his account of the transaction, which is believed to be correct, he was indicted, among other things equally harmless, for publishing that, "as to the Executive, when I shall see the efforts of that power bent on the promotion of the comfort and happiness, and the accommodation of the people, that Executive shall have my zealous and uniform support; but whenever I shall, on the part of the Executive, see every consideration of the public welfare swallowed up in a continued grasp for power, and an unbounded thirst for ridiculous pomp, foolish adulation, and selfish avarice, &c. I shall not be their humble advocate." Upon this accusation, and others of no greater import in my estimation, a pious, packed, political jury, selected for the purpose, under the direction of a party judge, inheriting the spirit of a Jeffries, and influenced with anglo-aristocratic zeal, brought in a verdict of "guilty." The author goes on to say, that in consequence of this unjustifiable verdict, and the subsequent cruel judgment, he was contumaciously dragged out of his own county, where a decent jail was at the disposal of the National Government, and in an ignominious manner carried fifty miles, and in a bad state of health, thrown into a dismal dungeon, the common receptacle of robbers, thieves, and murderers; and when three thousand citizens petitioned for his release, they were told by the President, that submission must precede pardon.

In 1800 the success of the Democratic party was complete. The voice of the people triumphed over the slanders and falsehoods which had been heaped upon the candidate of their choice. Thomas Jefferson was elected President. I will pass over the characteristic intrigue of the Federal party after their defeat in the attempt to elevate to that station an individual they had uniformly despised, and who had not received one vote of the people with the view to any such elevation, for the sole purpose of trampling under foot the solemnly expressed voice of the nation. It has become proverbial that traitors from the Democratic ranks find favor with our opponents, of which we have some high examples in modern times.

This glorious event was hailed with great joy by the friends of equal rights, in all parts of the country, as the harbinger of better days; and no one ever had occasion to say that his most sanguine expectations were not fully realized in the radical change of policy that ensued. The schemes for undermining the Constitution were defeated, and the Government restored to its primitive purity. But if it were desirable, it is not within the scope of my present design to speak very minutely of the great and salutary reform that immediately followed in the administration of public affairs. No Administration ever commenced under more favorable auspices, and none ever more fully lived up to the professions on which it was created, or contributed more largely to lay the lasting foundations of

Republican freedom: it was praised at the time by its friends, and it has since been eulogized by its enemies; and now, after the lapse of forty years, it is matter of grave dispute among us who shall be considered its followers. On this last point I shall have something to remark before I sit down—at present I wish to deal further with its opponents. The next fourteen years, embracing the period of the embargo, non-intercourse, and the late war with Great Britain, is one of great interest and full of instruction as to the motives and designs of the Federal party; their whole course, without interruption, was marked by a reckless opposition to the Government of the people, and seems to have been dictated by two leading motives—thirst for power and implacable hatred of incumbents in office; and their principal weapons of attack were falsehood, deception, and calumny. All their efforts were directed to one object, which is sufficiently disclosed in their motto, which was very generally adopted, that "the Administration must come down." It was no less true at that time than it is now, that about two-thirds of the political journals published in New England were opposed to the Administration, as well as the great proportion of wealth. It has been said, and I doubt not with truth, that for years not a single number of the Boston Centinel, Repository, &c. were published free from attacks of the most vilifying character on the Administration—every act of the President was misrepresented, and the most unholily and pernicious means were constantly employed to excite the prejudices of the people, against every public functionary, however elevated or humble. A large proportion of the wealthiest men in the community were combined in a flagitious effort to tear down the pillars of the Government, which had been erected at so great a sacrifice in the Revolutionary struggle for independence, not only by throwing every obstacle and embarrassment in their power in the way of its administration, but, as the sequel will show, by obstructing and harassing all its endeavors to protect and defend the national honor, and finally coalescing with its ancient and inveterate foe. Now, if this was patriotism, then these men were patriotic, and not otherwise.

This is not mere supposition—it is historical fact, and susceptible of the clearest demonstration; and I will freely acknowledge that it is not so much my object at this time to detain the committee with any remarks of my own, as to exhibit to the country anew the proofs of some of these allegations. This has become necessary, in consequence of the denial which has been made. Let us see whether this party has been misrepresented, and examine into their boasted patriotism. If I mistake not, it will be found to have consisted for a series of years in sympathy for the interests and designs of a foreign power, in opposition to the interests and honor of their own country. The conduct of England towards the United States had been one uninterrupted course of aggression and violation of national faith. Jealousy and ill will were the predominant features of her policy. She had on many occasions, and in the grossest manner, violated the treaty of peace. She had declined a treaty of commerce—she had impressed our seamen—she had



instigated the savage tribes to tomahawk and scalp American citizens—she had stimulated the mercenary and piratical of all nations to prey upon our unprotected commerce—and, in a word, “she had insulted our flag, and pillaged our trade in every quarter of the world.” Of the many violations of the laws of nations perpetrated by Great Britain, I will only glance at some of the most glaring, and those in an especial manner which had the most influence upon political parties at home, among which were the impressment of our seamen, under the pretence of right to search American vessels for deserters from the British navy, and the orders in council of the 16th of May, 1806, and the 11th of November, 1807.

The right of search had been claimed and wantonly exercised for many years, and had been repeatedly made the subject of remonstrance as far back as 1792. Both parties had complained of its injustice and of the iniquity of the practice, and had uniformly regarded it as a violation of the laws of nations. It is difficult to estimate the extent to which this outrage upon the rights and liberties of American seamen was carried. It has been estimated that, at the date of the declaration of war, on the 18th of June, 1812, not less than fourteen thousand persons had been seized upon the high seas and dragged from their lawful employment and homes. The British officer on board became at once the captor, accuser, witness, and judge, and yet one of the *patriotic* committees of the Massachusetts Legislature, for the double purpose of excusing Great Britain and casting reproach upon the Administration, reported that there were but eleven Massachusetts sailors on board the vessels of his Britannic Majesty in June, 1812.

The object of the orders in council, of the 16th of May, 1806, was to blockade the coast of Germany, Holland, and France, from Elbe to Brest, a distance of eight hundred miles. It was a mere paper blockade, in direct violation of the laws of nations, and a high-handed outrage of the neutral rights of the United States. The order in council, of the 11th of November, 1807, was issued professedly as a retaliation for the Berlin decree of France, whereby all neutral vessels, bound to France or her dependencies, or to any port from which British vessels were excluded, and all vessels furnished with French consular certificates, were declared liable to seizure and condemnation; but their real design was to compel the United States to declare war against our friend and ally in the Revolutionary struggle for independence; and in this design the Federal party concurred. These measures were destructive to the rights and interests of the United States, and especially to the commercial class, who were in a great measure driven from the ocean, and a lucrative trade, for no other purpose than to administer to the cupidity and malice of the “mistress of the sea;” and yet, strange as it may seem, many concurred in the general design, while at the same time they called loudly upon their own Government to relieve them from the embarrassments which it produced. Parties were divided as to the causes of their distress; but all demanded redress, and condemned the aggressions, and none were more clamorous than the very men

that subsequently opposed every effort of the Government in the most treasonable manner, to rescue our national interests from the ruin which must have ensued if no counteracting remedies had been adopted. Before this, Mr. Jefferson had been opposed with the usual billingsgate of party warfare; he had been denounced as a Jacobin, as an enemy to social order and religion; he had been accused of immorality and infidelity, and all the usual accusations of that party; he was now charged with weakness and imbecility, and even cowardice; and every measure was resorted to, to goad his administration into resistance of the high-handed and oppressive pretensions and outrages of the parent country. Negotiation had failed. Three expedients only were left to be tried—embargo, non-intercourse, and war. The merchants preferred the former, or, at all events, were willing to leave the whole subject to the constituted authorities. To this effect they certainly expressed themselves in their various petitions for redress.

It is sufficient to know that they demanded redress, and admit, if you please—for I believe it is true—they professed to be willing to leave to the decision of Congress the remedy to be prescribed. Public meetings were held in all the principal cities, and memorials to Congress adopted, setting forth their grievances in glowing colors, and pledging their aid and support in the most solemn manner, to any measure of relief which the wisdom of that body might judge expedient. The Federal merchants of Boston were among the first to memorialize Congress, and demand redress. I ask leave to read a few passages from that paper.

“Unless the present disposition of the British admiralty courts and navy officers can be counteracted and removed, a widely dispersed and unprotected commerce, extending to every region of the globe, will only serve to invite depredation, to bankrupt ourselves and enrich others, until such commerce be swept from the face of the ocean.”

They further state, “That a tacit submission to pretensions thus lofty, would be an abandonment of rights openly recognised, and a dereliction of the most important commercial interests of this country.” And they add: “Reason, and the most powerful considerations of equity, enjoin it as a duty on the United States, to oppose these pretensions.” And that “These pretensions are unsound in point of principle, offensive in practice, and nugatory in effect.” They charge the British Government with “preying upon the unprotected property of a friendly power;” and call upon the Administration “promptly to adopt such measures as might disembarass our commerce, assert our rights, and support the dignity of the United States.”

The Newburyport memorial alleges that—

“In many cases our vessels and cargoes have been captured, tried, and condemned, under unusual and alarming pretenses, which, if permitted to continue, threaten the ruin of our commercial interests. So far from obtaining redress of our grievances by the ordinary modes and processes of law, we have in most cases been subject to heavy costs, and suffered embarrassing and distressing detention of property, even when no pretence could be found to authorize the seizure of it. Having sustained these losses and injuries in the prosecution of our lawful commerce, and in the exercise of our just rights, we rely with confidence on the wisdom, firmness, and justice of our Government, to obtain for us that protection which a regard to the honor of our country, no less than the rights of our citizens, must dictate and require.”

The Salem memorial is even more explicit:

“These obstructions are of a very serious nature. When exercised in the mildest form, they produce oppressive searches

and delays, expensive litigation, and often a total failure of an otherwise lucrative voyage."

### They speak of the British policy,

"As letting loose the passions to prey on the miseries and plunder the property of the innocent. It would subject neutrals to hazards nearly as perilous as those of actual hostilities; and independent of its influence in stimulating to revenge and retaliation, it would transfer the benefits of peace to any victorious usurper of the ocean. Your memorialists wish to take no part in the contests which now convulse the world; but, acting with impartiality towards all nations, to reap the fruits of a just neutrality. If, however, conciliation cannot effect the purpose of justice, and an appeal to arms be the last and necessary protection of honor, they feel no disposition to decline the common danger, or shrink from the common contribution. Relying on the wisdom and firmness of the General Government in this behalf, they feel no hesitation to pledge their lives and properties in support of the measures which may be adopted to vindicate the public rights and redress the public wrongs."

Similar memorials emanated from New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and from almost every commercial city in the Union. The uniform tenor of the public press was in strict accordance with the prayers of these petitions. Press after press called upon the Government to redress the grievances of which the merchants, without distinction of party, complained, and in the most solemn manner, and in repeated instances, pledged their faith to the support of any measures to accomplish the object. On the 22d of June, 1807, the wanton attack was made on the Chesapeake by the Leopard, in consequence of the refusal of Commodore Barron to submit to the claimed right of search, and to deliver up four sailors on board the former, in pursuance of the iniquitous demand of the British officer. This raised the excitement to the highest pitch of indignation. All parties alike, the Federalists as much as the Democrats, clamored for reparation, with just abhorrence, of the insult offered to our national flag.

The excitement was so great it was deemed impolitic and unwise to convene Congress until sufficient time had elapsed for reflection, and for the resentments of the public mind to subside. In the mean time, to quiet the alarm which very generally prevailed, and to protect the interests and honor of the country from a repetition of such flagrant proceedings within our own jurisdiction, the President issued the proclamation of the second of July, forbidding British vessels of war in certain cases and under certain limitations to enter or remain in the ports or harbors of the United States. This was a mere precautionary step to guard against similar outrages until Congress could be convened. The whole subject of our relations with Great Britain was submitted to Congress at the extra session, on the 26th of October following; the embargo became a law on the 22d of December, 1807. No man dare risk his veracity, or his intelligence, by affirming that this measure was not adopted to meet the complaints of the Federal merchants, and to prepare the way for a redress of their grievances so vividly set forth in their memorials. It now becomes necessary to inquire how far these patriotic citizens, who have so much regard for the military reputation of their candidate for the Presidency, lived up to their professions—how far they redeemed their hollow and deceptive pledges to the country and the world, and with what sincerity they staked their lives and property in support of the measures which should be adopted to vindicate the public rights and redress the public wrongs. The truth is, they fulfilled no one of them, and never designed

to do so when they were made. It was all a sham and pretence of patriotism which they never felt, and was put forth for the purpose of deceiving the people, and aiding their party to power and place, at the expense of the real friends of the country. It was a part of that system which has fastened upon them the name of "the war party in peace, and the peace party in war." One of the best informed writers of that day remarks that "the clear, indisputable, and melancholy fact is, that, after having impelled and goaded the Government into measures to procure redress, they not merely withheld their support from those measures, but actually, as far as depended on them, prevented their success." After they had formally resolved "that the suffering armed vessels to station themselves off our harbors, and there to stop, search and capture our vessels—to impress, wound, and murder our citizens—is a gross and criminal neglect of the highest duties of Government, and that an administration that patiently permits the same is not entitled to the confidence of the people"—when that Administration, in the mildest manner possible, attempted to seek redress of the very wrongs which they had so feelingly portrayed, the leaders of the Federal party, in spite of their boasted patriotism, turned round and denounced the Administration which they had just before reproached for its supineness, and, in the violence of their opposition, actually coalesced with the common foe, to defeat and paralyze every effort to redress the very grievances of which they had complained. But it is my principal object, as already stated, to prove what I allege; for which purpose, I shall be obliged to read sundry extracts from the leading newspapers of that period, which seem to me to afford strong evidence of the motives and designs of the Federal party, especially of its leaders; and also to refer to sundry letters and proceedings which appear to be equally corroborative of the same points.

"Every man will presume that he is not bound to regard it (the embargo), but may send his produce or his merchandise to a foreign market in the same manner as if the Government had not undertaken to prohibit it."—*Boston Centinel*.

"We know if the embargo be not removed, our citizens will, ere long, set its penalties and restrictions at defiance. It behooves us to speak; for strike we must, if speaking does not answer."—*Boston Repository*.

"It is better to suffer the amputation of a limb than to lose the whole body. We must prepare for the operation. Wherefore, then, is New England asleep? Wherefore does she submit to the oppression of enemies in the South? Have we no Moses, who is inspired by the God of our fathers, and will lead us out of the land of Egypt?"—*Boston Gazette*.

"This perpetual embargo being unconstitutional, every man will perceive that he is not bound to regard it. If the petitions do not produce a relaxation, the people ought immediately to assume a higher tone. The Government of Massachusetts has also a duty to perform. This State is still sovereign and independent."—*Boston Centinel*.

"In my mind, the present crisis excites the most serious apprehension. A storm seems to be gathering, which portends, not a tempest on the ocean, but domestic convulsions. I feel myself bound in conscience to declare, lest the blood of those who should fall in the execution of this measure (the embargo) may lie on my head, that I consider this to be an act which directs a mortal blow at the liberties of my country: an act containing unconstitutional provisions to which the people are not bound to submit, and to which, in my opinion, they will not submit."—*Speech of Mr. Hillhouse*.

This subject might be pursued much further; but the lateness of the hour admonishes me of the necessity of brevity. But I cannot forbear to give one more extract, to show the aim and object of all



this clamor and complaint, without even proposing any substitute. It is characteristic of Federal policy to find fault with every thing, and propose nothing:

"The original embargo act had been openly and frequently violated. The public prints in Boston had audaciously and sedulously invited the citizens to set it at defiance. The British Government had also, as we have seen, added the allurements of its powerful invitation. Such an invitation was unnecessary. There are always to be found, in every community, men who will seek the shortest road to fortune, whether through the dark paths of smuggling or otherwise; and these men united their obstreperous brawlings with the clamor raised by those whose grand object was to harass the Government for the chance of regaining the power they had lost."—*M. Carey.*

This shows in very admirable colors the community of interest which then existed between the office seeker and the speculator, and evinces the venality of motive which governed their actions, and prompted their efforts to overthrow the Government of the people. One more reference on this point, and I have done:

"You have reposed confidence in a coward [Jefferson] and leaned on a broken staff too long. The day of political probation is fast verging to a close, when the fate of America will be decided, and laurels, bought with the price of freemen's blood, will grace the brows of the Gallic tyrant. Let every man who holds the name of America dear to him, stretch out his hand and put this accursed thing [the embargo] forever from him. Be resolute—act like the sons of liberty, of God, and your country—nerve your arms with vengeance against the despot who would wrest the inestimable germ of your independence from you, and you shall be conquerors. Give ear no longer to the siren song of Democracy and Jeffersonian liberty: it is a cursed delusion, adopted by traitors and recommended by sycophants. Jefferson, the man who, with the dagger of popular confidence, first gave the stroke to your liberties."—*Newburyport Circular.*

It was during the period of these publications that the leaders of the Federal party in New England are believed to have plotted the dissolution of the Union, and the establishment of a Northern confederacy upon its ruins. The excitement was carried to the utmost pitch of exasperation. The press teemed with calumny and falsehood levelled at the President and his administration, the principal object of which was to prove a secret alliance with France, in her attempts to prostrate the power and influence of the British crown.

After the labored defence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I hope I may be excused for detaining the committee for a few minutes, while I exhibit some of the proofs which have induced the opinion which he seems to think is so uncharitable. It is not necessary for me to remark that I have no other knowledge upon the subject, except what is available to all who will take the trouble to examine it. In the first place, I will refer to the mission of John Henry:

*Mr. Ryland, Secretary to Sir James Craig, late Governor General of the British Provinces in North America, to Mr. Henry.*

(Most secret and confidential.)

"QUEBEC, Jan. 26, 1809.

"MY DEAR SIR: The extraordinary state of things at this time in the Eastern States has suggested to the Governor in Chief the idea of employing you on a secret and confidential mission to Boston, provided an arrangement can be made to meet the important end in view, without throwing an absolute obstacle in the way of your professional pursuits. The information and political observations heretofore received from you, were transmitted by his Excellency to the Secretary of State, who has expressed his particular approbation of them," &c.

*From the instructions of J. H. Craig to Mr. Henry.*

(Most secret and confidential.)

"QUEBEC, 6th February, 1808.

"The principal object that I recommend to your attention is the endeavor to obtain the most accurate information of the

true state of affairs in that part of the Union which, from its wealth, the number of its inhabitants, and the known intelligence of several of its leading men, must naturally possess a very considerable influence over, and will indeed probably lead the other Eastern States of America in the part they may take at this important crisis. I think it necessary to put you on your guard against the sanguineness of an aspiring party. The Federalists, as I understand, have at all times discovered a leaning to this disposition, and their being under its particular influence at this moment, is the more to be expected from their having no ill (well) founded ground for their hopes, of being nearer the attainment of their object, than they have been for some years past. It has been supposed that if the Federalists of the Eastern States should be successful in obtaining that decided influence which may enable them to direct public opinion, it is not improbable that, rather than submit to the continuance of the difficulties and distress to which they are now subject, they will exert that influence to bring about a separation from the general Union. The earliest information on this subject may be of great consequence to our Government, as it may also be that it should be informed how far, in such an event, they would look to England for assistance, or be disposed to enter into a connection with us."

*Credential from Sir James Craig to Mr. Henry.*

"The bearer, Mr. John Henry, is employed by me, and full confidence may be placed in him for any communication which any person may wish to make to me in the business committed to him. In faith of which, I have given him this under my hand and seal at Quebec, the 6th day of February, 1809.

"J. H. CRAIG."

In pursuance of this commission, Mr. Henry proceeded to the Eastern States, in prosecution of the design, which very clearly appears from the cautious and stealthy language of his letter of instructions. The following are extracts from his correspondence, which evinces, beyond controversy, the brilliant hopes he entertained of success, and the accuracy of his information as to the temper and disposition of parties in this country:

"I learn that the Governor of this State (Vermont) is now visiting the towns in the northern sections of it, and makes no secret of his determination, as commander-in-chief of the militia, to refuse obedience to any command from the General Government, which can tend to interrupt the good understanding that prevails between the citizens of Vermont and his Majesty's subjects in Canada."

Again, he says:

"Notwithstanding, while there is every reason to hope that the Northern States, in their distinct capacity, will unite, and resist by force a war with Great Britain, great pains are taken by men of talents and intelligence to confirm the fears of the common people as to the concurrence of the Southern Democrats in the projects of France, and every thing tends to encourage the belief that the dissolution of the Confederacy will be accelerated by that spirit which now acuates both parties."

In another letter, he observes:

"The Federal party declare, that, in the event of a war, the State of Vermont will treat separately for itself with Great Britain, and support, to the utmost of the stipulations into which it may enter, without any regard to the policy of the General Government."

Under date of March 5, 1809, he says:

"I have sufficient means of information to enable me to judge of the proper period for offering the co-operation of Great Britain, and opening a correspondence between the Governor-General of British America and those individuals who, from the part they take in the opposition to the National Government, or the influence they may possess in any new order of things that may grow out of the present difference, should be qualified to act in behalf of the Northern States."

Boston, March 7, he again writes:

"I have already given a decided opinion that a declaration of war is not to be expected; but, contrary to all reasonable calculations, should the Congress possess spirit and independence enough to place their popularity in jeopardy by so strange a measure, the Legislature of Massachusetts will give the tone to the neighboring States—will declare itself permanent until a new election of members—invite a Congress, to be composed of delegates from the Federal States, and effect a separate Government for their common defence and common interest. This Congress would probably begin by abrogating the offensive laws, and adopting a plan of Government for the maintenance of the power and authority assumed. They would, by such an act, be in a condition to make or receive proposals from Great Britain."

This letter discloses a very remarkable fact, which cannot be passed over without notice. Five

years before the time of the Hartford Convention, this British agent informs his superior of the outline of the plan which was subsequently attempted, and partly carried into success, and which might have succeeded at the adjourned meeting which was to have been held in the following summer, but for the triumph of our arms at the battle of New Orleans, and the news of the treaty of peace that immediately succeeded. He states not only some of the important details of the convention, as it actually took place, several years after, but the motives that would induce it, and the general objects that were to be accomplished, one of which was a separate Government for their common defence and common interest.

It is unreasonable to believe that this information was manufactured for the purpose of deceiving his employer; and especially is it so, as the facts and speculations which he communicates have since become matters of history, at least to a very considerable extent, and doubtless would have been fully attempted, if not successfully carried into operation, but for the providential events of which I have spoken, that prevented their execution, and overwhelmed their projectors with eternal disgrace and infamy. But, sir, I have other testimony equally conclusive, if not of a higher nature, that I will submit to the committee, without remark or commentary:

*Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Giles, Dec. 25, 1825.*

"He (Mr. Adams) spoke then of the dissatisfaction of the Eastern portion of our confederacy with the restraints of the embargo then existing, and their restlessness under it. That there was nothing which might not be attempted to rid themselves of it. That he had information of the most unquestionable certainty, that certain citizens of the Eastern States (I think he named Massachusetts particularly) were in negotiation with the agents of the British Government. The object of which was an agreement that the New England States should take no further part in the war then going on; that without formally declaring their separation from the Union of the States, they should withdraw from all aid and obedience to them; that their navigation and commerce should be free from restraint or interruption by the British; that they should be considered and treated by them as neutrals, and, as such, might conduct themselves towards both parties; and, at the close of the war, be at liberty to rejoin the confederacy. He assured me that there was imminent danger that the convention would take place; that the temptations were such as might debase many from their fidelity to the Union; and that, to enable its friends to make head against it, the repeal of the embargo was absolutely necessary. I expressed a just sense of the merit of the information, and of the importance of the disclosure to the safety, and eventual salvation, of our country; and, however reluctant I was to abandon the measure, (a measure which, persevered in a little longer, we had subsequent and satisfactory assurance, would have effected its object completely,) from that moment, and influenced by that information, I saw the necessity of abandoning it, and, instead of our effecting our purpose by this peaceful weapon, we must fight it out, or break the Union."

*Extract of an authorized statement by Mr. Adams, in explanation, published in the National Intelligencer, October 21, 1828.*

"Mr. Giles, and several other members of Congress, during this session (1805) wrote to Mr. Adams confidential letters, informing him of the various measures proposed as reinforcements or substitutes for the embargo, and soliciting his opinions upon the subject. He answered those letters with frankness and in confidence. He earnestly recommended the substitution of the non-intercourse for the embargo; and, in giving his reasons for this preference, was necessarily led to enlarge upon the views and purposes of certain leaders of the party which had the management of the State Legislature in their hands. He urged that continuance of the embargo much longer would certainly be met by forcible resistance, supported by the Legislature, and probably by the Judiciary of the State.

"That to quell that resistance, if force should be resorted to by the Government, it would produce a civil war; and in that event, he had no doubt that the leaders of the party would secure the co-operation with them of Great Britain. That their object was, and had been for several years, a dissolution of the Union,

and the establishment of a separate confederation, he knew from unequivocal evidence, although not proveable in a court of law; and that, in the case of a civil war, the aid of Great Britain to effect that purpose would be as surely resorted to, as it would be indispensably necessary to the design."

All who remember the period when this statement made its appearance, cannot have forgotten the excitement which it produced in New England, and especially among the Boston Federalists, who, at the time, were among the most devoted supporters of Mr. Adams. The press took up the subject, and demanded of the individuals whose situation was such, at the period alluded to, as to designate them among the persons included in the charge, to call upon Mr. Adams for some more specific statement of the accusation. A writer in the Boston Courier says:

"This we, the Federal party, the citizens of Massachusetts, the people of New England, require of them. We are all implicated in the accusation, and all feel its effects; nor can we rest satisfied until it is brought home to individuals, or scattered to the winds."

On the 26th of November, 1828, Harrison G. Otis and twelve others, all leading Federalists in Massachusetts, most of whom are still living and active members of the Whig party, addressed a communication to Mr. Adams, calling for the names of the persons charged, and the evidence upon which the charge rests. Among other things, they say:

"We were associated in politics with the party prevailing here at the period referred to in the statement above mentioned; some of us concurred in all the measures adopted by that party; and we all warmly approved and supported them. Many of our associates, who still survive, are dispersed throughout Massachusetts and Maine, and could not be easily convened, to join us on the present occasion."

Mr. Adams's reply, under date of the 26th of December, is very full and explicit; from which I beg leave to read a few extracts:

"It was in those letters of 1808 and 1809, that I mentioned the design of certain leaders of the Federal party, and the establishment of a Northern confederacy, &c.

"This plan was so far matured, that the proposal had been made to an individual, at the proper time, to be placed at the head of the military movement which, it was foreseen, would be necessary for carrying it into execution.

"The interposition of a kind Providence averted the most deplorable of catastrophes, and turning over to the receptacle of things lost upon earth, the adjourned convention from Hartford to Boston, extinguished (by the mercy of heaven, may it be forever!) the projected New England Confederacy."

In conclusion, he intimates very strongly, that at some future day, a sense of duty may induce him to disclose the evidence which he possesses, and for which they call, but says, the selection of the day must be left to his own judgment—that no array of numbers or power can induce him to make the disclosure prematurely, or to withhold it "when a sense of duty shall sound the alarm." It has already appeared that Mr. Jefferson and his party were obliged to abandon the embargo, to save the Union from the treasonable designs of the Federal party in the Eastern States. Non-intercourse was substituted, on the first of March, 1809. This act met with little or no better reception. It was, at once, denounced as having been dictated by French influence, and as a measure of hostility to England. The cry of French influence and Southern influence were the principal weapons of Federal warfare, in the North, throughout the period of which I am speaking. After the failure of Mr. Erskine's arrangement, the bitterness of party feeling was resumed, if it can be said to have subsided, while it was believed that the overtures he had made



would be sanctioned by the British Cabinet. Upon this point, I desire to make one or two remarks, to show the disingenuousness and insincerity of Federal Opposition, and then I will pass on with as much rapidity as possible. While it was supposed that the arrangement had been made by authority, they openly charged that it was precisely what the British Government had always been willing to do; but the moment it was ascertained that it had been rejected upon the pretence that the Minister had transcended his powers, with characteristic regard for truth, they unblushingly asserted that Mr. Madison knew, at the time, that no such instructions had been given, and that he had fraudulently consented to the arrangement, to deceive the people, and gain popularity. The press made this charge, and the minions of party joined in the cry. It soon became evident that hostilities must ensue, as all peaceful efforts to obtain justice had been exhausted, without any success. All parties again demanded redress, and none were more clamorous than those that subsequently opposed the war with so much violence and rancor. It was said that the Administration wanted energy, and that all the difficulty was justly chargeable to its weakness and corruption, and no expression was more common with these patriotic citizens than the one ascribed to their leader in Congress, that the Administration "could not be kicked into a war." They urged the Government on to the brink of hostilities, by complaints and reproaches of the most vindictive character, until it was impossible to recede, without sacrifice both of the rights and honor of the nation; and when the issue was presented, and no alternative left but dishonor, they not only voted against the declaration of war, but immediately adopted an inflammatory address to excite the people to oppose it. Their opposition during the war is so well known, and so universally execrated, that it is not necessary to dwell upon it. The Federal party, in Massachusetts, were more rancorous and uncharitable in their opposition than in any State in the Union. They declared, in the form of a legislative declaration, that "the war was founded in falsehood, declared without necessity, and its real object was extent of territory, by unjust conquests, and to aid the late tyrant of Europe in his view of aggrandizement." Such declaratory resolutions were a very frequent occurrence, though, I believe, they did not require the sanction of both branches of the Legislature.

It would be an endless task, as well as useless labor, to recite all the evidences of the reckless opposition to the war. They withheld, as far as it was within their power, the means for supporting the army and navy; they discouraged enlistments; they prevented loans, and actually devised a regular system for exporting specie out of the country, to cripple the Government, by depriving it of the sinews of war; and, when victory crowned the efforts of the brave, they resolved that "it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to express any approbation of military or naval exploits." This relentless and heartless opposition was kept up, with unabated fury, down to the victory at New Orleans and the subsequent news of the treaty of peace. Peace was concluded on the 24th of December, 1814, but the news did not reach this

country until after the battle at New Orleans. The Hartford Convention assembled on the 15th of December, 1814, and adjourned to meet at Boston in the following June, which meeting never took place, but was turned "over to the receptacle of things lost upon earth." The victory of New Orleans, and the treaty of peace, made the triumph of the Democratic party complete. No language can describe their joy. The Federalists were overwhelmed, as well by the successful termination of the conflict, as by the knowledge of the odium which would attach to their treasonable opposition. It is a little remarkable that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] should suppose that the overthrow of Napoleon, at the battle of Waterloo, induced the Federal party to disband. That battle did not take place until the following season. It was another great and glorious victory, on this side of the ocean, which seems to have escaped his recollection, that compelled the leaders of that party, at least for the time, to abandon their projects of ambition, and to acquiesce in the ascendancy of the favorites of the people.

The next eight years succeeding the war, has been called the "era of good feeling," during which the Federal party endeavored to wipe off, by every species of obsequiousness, the disgrace of their past misdeeds, without any change of their cherished principles. Party organization was abandoned, and of course the animosity of feeling which had long prevailed, subsided. These "no party times," as they have been called, continued, at least in New England, until the election of John Q. Adams by the House of Representatives. The events which led to that result are familiar to all, and need not be recapitulated. Admit, if you please, for it is true, that Mr. Adams was supported by many of the old Republicans; and it is equally true that the body of the Federal party, aroused from their lethargy, rallied to his support. Shortly after his election, the declaration was made, with some appearance of authority, that those who fell with the first Adams should rise with the second; and the course of his administration was supposed to furnish ground for such belief. The old party feeling was aroused to a very high degree of excitement at the ensuing Presidential election; the mass of the Democratic party were embodied again under the banner of Jeffersonian principles, in opposition to an Administration which commanded the confidence and respect of the tariff and bank party in every quarter of the Union. It is impossible for me, at this time, to speak of the beneficial change in the administration of public affairs that was introduced by General Jackson. It is recorded in the grateful remembrance of the people, and constitutes one of the brightest and most enduring pages in the history of the country.

The calumnies and falsehoods that were heaped upon that distinguished individual, by the old opposers of Jefferson, have gone to the "tomb of the Capulets," and it only remains to complete the parallel, after he shall have been consigned to the grave, for his enemies to pronounce his eulogy. Professions of economy are becoming very fashionable, and a most deliberate attempt is made to fasten upon the present Administration the charge of extravagance in the expenditure of the public mo-

ney. Let no one accuse me of undervaluing any just system of economy; on the contrary, I hold it to be indispensable, in a Republican form of Government, to secure it from corruption, and all the evil tendencies of monarchical institutions. But the appropriate inquiry is, who are the friends of economy, and whose principles, if adopted, will lead to extravagance? I will give one fact to illustrate my views on this subject, after remarking that the only security against improvident expenditure, is to raise no more money from the pockets of the people, than is necessary to meet the obligations of the country upon the strictest principles of frugality. If taxes are levied and collected, the money will be expended; and, indeed, there seems to be a necessity that it should be, for no one will pretend that it would be just or wise to hoard up the currency, or shut it out of circulation. Hence the impolicy of a high tariff; for, if money is collected it must be expended, and this engenders extravagance, and tends to corruption. The fact to which I wish to call your attention, is the veto of the Maysville road bill.

It has been said very justly, I believe, that, at the time when that measure was arrested by the moral courage of General Jackson, unconstitutional appropriations were contemplated to the vast amount of one hundred millions of dollars, by the advocates of the system of which that bill was the germ. Some of the friends of the President were alarmed when they learned his intention to veto it, and even went so far as to desire him to yield to the wishes of a majority of Congress. The result is known. The Democratic party sustained him with increased vigor; and, though a few deserted, the mass remained firm. This was a specimen of economy worth talking about, the influence of which will be felt, it is to be hoped, through all coming time. One would think that the advocates of this system of wasteful and unconstitutional expenditure would be restrained, by a sense of delicacy, from making charges of extravagance against those whom they have uniformly derided as the upholders of a niggardly policy of retrenchment. It is not denied, that, for a time, many honest Democrats were found in opposition to that Administration, through a feeling of distrust of the fitness or prudence of the incumbent, which had been engendered by the violence and wickedness of his opposers, and by the wide-spread calumnies which had been circulated for the purpose of blackening his character and blasting his reputation—a reputation which had been earned in the field of danger, through toil and peril, in defence of the honor and glory of his country. But as the policy of his Administration was developed, these ill-grounded fears were dissipated in the cheering exhibitions of wisdom, patriotism, and sound Republican principles, which characterized his course, and furnished the most gratifying assurance of that devotion to principle which so signally marked his public career. At his second election, the whole Democratic party in New England, with the exception of a few individuals, who became traitors to their own principles, were united, and gave to the hero of New Orleans a generous and hearty support. No one can oppose to this declaration a successful denial. Each party rallied under the respective

banners of their long cherished principles, and entered into the contest with spirit and determination. With very few exceptions, the Federalists gave their support to Mr. Adams. It is a very common saying, that "one swallow does not make summer," or, as the legal maxim has it, that "a single instance does not make law;" so, the party association of a few individuals, after the lapse of many years, does not afford any evidence of the principles of the party with which they happen to be classed, with reference to a previous organization, or the position of the masses of which that organization was composed. I am willing to admit that a few Democrats remained in opposition, and that, generally speaking, they maintain, to this day, like all traitors, that every body has changed his principles and position, except themselves; that, while they have stood firm and inflexible, each of the two great political parties of the country has changed sides—that is, the Federalists have become Democrats, for their particular accommodation, and the Democrats have abandoned their cherished principles and joined their enemies, although, if the story be true, there was scarcely any one left for them to join.

On the other hand, I am not disposed to deny that a small portion of the Federal party supported the election of General Jackson, most of whom have deserted and gone back to their old associates; and, without meaning any disrespect to individuals, it is my sincere desire that they may never return to make further trouble in the Democratic ranks. Those that remain, are believed to be sincere, in the change of principles which they profess. Generally speaking, they acknowledge their past errors, and avow their change of principle and position. This I believe to be the true state of the case. I can speak with the utmost confidence, when I say that within the limit of my own acquaintance, it is an undeniable fact, that the mass of the old Republicans then living, were the warm and zealous supporters of the second election of President Jackson, and continued throughout to approve of the principles and measures of his administration; the distinctive features of which were a strict construction of the Constitution, opposition to a National Bank, the reduction of the tariff and the receipts of the Treasury, as far as possible without injury to the great interests of the country, to the wants of the Government upon the strictest principles of accountability and economy, and an undeviating hostility to unconstitutional appropriations upon local objects of improvement. That the Federal party opposed this Administration, its principles and policy, with unrelenting and uncompromising hostility, is susceptible of the clearest demonstration, if the fact does not stand confessed. All the old Federal presses, including the Boston Centinel, teemed with abuse and misrepresentation of the same reckless character as had marked their opposition to Jefferson and Madison. But proof on this point would be a work of supererogation, and therefore I will desist. My confidence in the intelligence of the people, induces me to believe that they cannot be deceived in this matter, relating, as it does, to events which are fresh in their recollection. If these things be so, an inference will follow, when one other fact is



established, about which I imagine there is still less dispute, of great importance in the inquiry which I am pursuing. The additional fact that I wish to establish, I presume no one will deny, and therefore does not require proof, but may be fairly assumed; and it is, that the supporters, principles, and policy, of the present Administration, are identical with the one that preceded it. It may be said that it is in contemplation to substitute the Independent Treasury system for the collection, safe keeping, and disbursement of the public money, in the place of the State banks; but this does not afford the distinction required. The State banks were selected as an experiment. It has signally failed, through the misconduct and bad faith of the banks themselves; and it is well known, that, after the suspension of specie payments in 1837, and the refusal of the banks to pay over nearly thirty millions of the public money, which had been collected from the people, and deposited with the banks for safe keeping, General Jackson, no less than Mr. Van Buren, became satisfied that no further confidence could be reposed in them as depositories of the public treasure, and both alike approved of the new recommendation that was made, and which, I trust, before this session terminates, will become the law of the land. One accusation of the Opposition is, therefore, fully sustained, and will be cheerfully admitted, that Mr. Van Buren is "treading in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor." I hope gentlemen will not back out of this charge, because it may be convenient to do so to avoid the consequences of an issue they wish to escape. Will any one undertake to deny that the principles and measures of the two Administrations are the same in all the essential elements of national policy? Surely no one will attempt it; and that their supporters are the same in New England, with individual exceptions, I appeal to every city, district, and village in that section of country, for the confirmation of what I affirm; and I am willing to stand or fall before my constituents, upon the truth of the fact which I have now stated, confining its application, of course, to the limits of my acquaintance, which is not very limited, in two or three of those States. Every member of the Hartford Convention now living, is opposed to this Administration. The talented and distinguished committee that addressed Mr. Adams, and called upon him for the evidence to sustain the charge he had made against themselves, or their associates, who were "dispersed throughout Massachusetts and Maine," at least so many of them as are now living, are members of the Whig party; and the Boston Centinel, and other old Federal journals, constitute the leading organs of that party in the unparalleled and unheard of struggle to overthrow the present Democratic Administration; and if all these things be so, it remains for the people to determine, as they surely will, who are the followers of Jefferson, and who are Federalists. The principles of parties at the present time will now be considered with a little more particularity, but with as much brevity as possible. It has already appeared, that, throughout the period of party organization, they have been separated by an impassable gulf in their views and

feelings, upon the construction of the Constitution. In the progress of events, other questions, temporary in their nature, have largely contributed to the bitterness and acrimony of party strife, which at times has threatened the existence of the Union itself; but as these temporary causes of irritation pass away, parties are seen to settle down upon the standard of principle, upon which the division first took place. Such is the case at the present time, in spite of all the efforts in certain quarters to conceal it. The present contest is one for principle, and its dividing line is bottomed upon the construction of the Constitution as leading to different measures of policy in the administration of public affairs. Of the many essential grounds of division between parties under the existing organization, I shall only be able to speak of some of those which have attracted the largest share of public attention under preceding Administrations. This Administration, and the party supporting it, are opposed to a National Bank, believing it to be both unconstitutional and inexpedient.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that this question has lost nothing of the importance that was originally attached to it by its early opposers, from the lights of experience; but, on the contrary, its dangerous tendency has been fully demonstrated, in the fearful exhibitions of the powerful and despotic sway over the property and liberty of the citizens, which such an institution is capable of exerting, when placed under the control of corporate power, and subject to the direction of designing men. The conduct of the late Bank of the United States is fresh in the recollection of the people of this country, and need not be recapitulated. It is sufficient to say, that the worst fears and apprehensions of its opposers have been realized to their utmost extent, and so much so that it is my deliberate opinion that a great majority of the American people have become sick and tired of the periodical fluctuations in the currency, which are the inevitable consequence of a paper standard of value. The reasons of this opinion I will forbear to state, as it would be inconsistent with the general design of my remarks. It is more my object to ascertain what are the principles of the Democratic party, for the purpose of contrasting them with those of the other side, than to detain the committee by entering into a full explanation and defence of them. The soundest principles of economy, as well as of justice, are opposed to a high tariff. It is a perversion of the taxing power which was confided to Congress by the Constitution for the purpose of providing for the general welfare of the whole Union, and not for the benefit of a few individuals at the expense of the many. Any system, therefore, which imposes burdens upon the body of the people to confer favor upon a limited class of individuals or corporations, is a perversion and infraction of the grant to lay taxes, because it is not to provide for the general welfare of the whole, but to administer to the cupidity and avarice of the few; and, therefore, any exaction for the sole benefit of one branch of industry, at the expense of all others, is a germ of Federal construction, not authorized by the Constitution, the whole tendency of which is to pervert our Republican institutions from a state of

purity and simplicity, into a splendid system of national power, in subversion of the rights of the States, and of the liberties of the people. A strict constitutional limitation of the taxing power, is the only safeguard against corruption and extravagance. Hence the sleepless vigilance of the Democratic party in their opposition to an unauthorized tariff. The aim and objects of its projectors will be hinted at hereafter. Again: no one pretends that there is any express grant to authorize the appropriation of the national treasure upon local objects of improvement. This, too, is based upon construction, and is claimed by implication. The Democratic party oppose it upon constitutional grounds, as well as on account of the injustice and inequality of its operation upon the different sections of the Union. It is a gambling, log-rolling system, calculated to corrupt the deliberations of Congress, and to foster division and heart burnings among the several States of the Confederacy.

On this point I desire to be distinctly understood. It is not the danger of exasperation of sectional feeling that constitutes the essential ground of the opposition of the Democratic party to this system, for that has reference to its expediency; but it is regarded as the exercise of an unauthorized power, contravening the Constitution and infringing upon the sovereignty of the States. There are very strong objections to it on the score of expediency. In addition to what has been said, it leads to unnecessary and exorbitant taxation, by creating new objects of appropriation, without number or bound, except in the discretion of Congress. It has been called the sluiceway of the tariff system, and I do not know of a more appropriate name. The friends of the tariff have uniformly supported it, for the reason, undoubtedly, that the drain from the Treasury, which it occasions, would further their designs. In all its consequences it is productive of evil, without any counterbalancing good. Again: the power to collect money to any amount from the people and to distribute it as a matter of favor to the States, or to corporations, is a species of despotism of the most odious character. The projected schemes of distribution find no favor with the Democratic party. They have resisted it, and will continue to resist it, in any and every shape and form in which it may be presented, whether under the pretence of donation or under the disguise of the assumption of the State debts.

The policy to be pursued in relation to the public domain demands the most solemn consideration of the community, and is likely to excite very much of public attention, for many years to come, both on account of its bearing upon the finances of the country, and the principles involved in the various schemes that have been projected to divert the accruing profit of the annual sales from the Nation Treasury. The distribution system is the most formidable and the most dangerous of any that has been presented, on account of the bait which it offers to the indebted States, no less than to the manufacturers, who see that, if it prevails, it must lay the foundation for a very great increase of taxation, and contribute very largely to their interests and designs. The mode of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public money, is an important fea-

ture in every system of national policy. Taxes must be levied, in some way, and, to a greater or less extent, in all Governments; and the money must be collected and disbursed in one currency or another. The policy of the Democratic party, in this behalf, is well known, though it has been shamefully misrepresented in all its objects and effects. It is true that Government dues will be prospectively collected in gold and silver, and that the payments to the army and navy, and all the public creditors, will be made in the same currency, as they ought to be, and must be, if we are to have a Government of the people and not of the bank; but the States will be left to regulate their own institutions in their own way; and it should not be forgotten that the specie that the Government collects is immediately distributed among the people, and goes into the general circulation. The effect of this measure will be to infuse into the circulating medium of the country a larger proportion of the precious metals, and to contribute in no small degree the means to secure the convertibility of bank paper in the several States by preventing the exportation of specie, while the process of collection and payment will distribute it among the people, where it is less exposed to the grasp of the speculators and brokers at the moment of pecuniary distress, and, by the natural laws of trade, it will flow back to relieve the banks in the hour of peril, and enable them to maintain a specie basis. Another, and a very important consideration at this time, is the subject of Abolition. A sincere attachment to the union of the States is among the cardinal doctrines in the creed of Democratic Republicanism, and ever has been, from the foundation of the Government to the present time. It has already appeared that the cry of Southern influence was a prominent topic of Federal warfare in the North, in the days of Jefferson and Madison, to excite the prejudices of the North against the South, and the seeds of political abolition may be seen in the proceedings of the Hartford Convention, where they propose an amendment to the Constitution, "so that Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned according to their respective numbers of free persons, excluding Indians not taxed, and all other persons." The supporters of this Administration in the North, with a few exceptions, are utterly opposed to all the mean and incendiary schemes of political Abolitionists. They are determined to maintain inviolate the compromises of the Constitution, in good faith, and under all circumstances. I mean not to say that the Whig party are all Abolitionists, but most of the Abolitionists are Whigs; and some of their political leaders are incessant in their efforts to make political capital out of the natural prejudices of a free people against the institution of slavery, and also out of the past proceedings of Congress touching the disposition of Abolition petitions. The Abolitionists in the district I represent, almost to a man, vote the Whig ticket. If, at the time of my election, I received one vote from that quarter, it is unknown to me. I do not believe that any such case can be found. Having said thus much, I will only add on this point, that many of the Abolitionists are honest and upright men, and sincerely believe they are engaged in



375

God's service, without the remotest intention of doing any thing to hazard the peace of the country, or the union of the States. It was my intention to have made a few remarks as to the right of the people to be informed of the views and principles of candidates for elective offices; but this ground has been so ably and fully occupied by those that have preceded me in the debate, that I despair of being able to offer any thing either new or useful, and therefore I will forbear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I approach a more difficult inquiry. What are the principles of the party calling themselves Whigs? If we look at the present, we have no means to form any conclusion whatever; silence and secrecy reign throughout the land. Recent information discloses the fact that they have gone through the parade and form of a national convention, and presented candidates to the American people for the first two offices within their gift, but adjourned without "any general declaration of the views of the great Opposition party;" and we are since told, with the air of authority, that "it was deemed impolitic, at the then crisis," to make any such exposition—for the reason, undoubtedly, "that no new issue be made to the public." But the people were not satisfied to take these important matters on trust; and, when they found they were seriously called upon to discard their public servants, and give their places to others, the inquiry, as was natural, at once arose, wherein will the country be benefited by the change? It seems the people supposed they had a right to know what they were to expect, if they should consent to the change. They believed it was a matter in which they had some interest; and, as the convention had neglected to inform them, they thought they would apply to the General himself. Knowing that General Jackson was an honest, frank man, and never concealed his opinions, they could not doubt that General Harrison would take great pleasure in informing them upon matters of such vital interest, to enable them to determine what course they would adopt at the approaching election. But the only answer yet received is the one from his confidential committee, in which they say "that their policy is, that the General make no further declaration of his principles for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position." So that the people are still in the dark upon the subject of the inquiry, and likely to remain so, unless information can be had from other sources than General Harrison or his confidential committee. To prevent misrepresentation, I will say, once and for all, that it is no part of my intention to disparage General Harrison, or to speak disrespectfully of any man living, but it has been my object throughout to deal with the party opposed to this Administration with the freedom which the Constitution secures to every Representative of the people. The inquiry is still to be answered, what are the principles of the Opposition? One of the best definitions that I have seen, is to be found in a letter of J. Q. Adams to Dutee J. Pierce, dated 7th September 1835. Here Mr. C. read the letter, of which the following are extracts:

"I am yet convinced that the party which has been there two years, struggling to break you down, the base compound of

Hartford Convention Federalism and royal arch masonry, is so rotten with the corruption of both its elements that I hail with joy the victory which you have achieved over it."

Again he says:

"Of that party, treachery is so favorite an instrument, that I have heard Mr. Burgess complains that they have used it even with him. It is their nature and their vocation."

And again:

"They have no honest principle to keep them together; their only cement is a sympathy of hatred to every man of purer principles than themselves."

It is proper to remark, that Mr. Adams does not use the term Whig party, but he was speaking of the party opposed to Mr. Pierce, and every one knows which party that was. Now, it would not be parliamentary for me to say that any member of this committee was destitute of political principle, but I have a right to say, that the Whig party, as such, has no principles of national policy, which they dare avow. If this be a mistake, why is it not corrected? If it is not convenient for the hero to speak, why do not his friends speak for him? If one committee is not sufficient, give him more, but let us have an answer. The people want light—they demand it, and if their reasonable request is refused, does any one so far undervalue their intelligence as to suppose they will be deceived as to the reasons which dictate the refusal? It is impossible. What is the course of the Opposition press at this time? Absolutely filled with mere hurrah, and nothing but hurrah. When the inquiry is made of them, Is your candidate in favor of a national bank? we are met with the answer, Hurrah for Tippecanoe. Is he in favor of a high tariff? a similar answer is ready: hurrah for the "log cabin and hard cider;" and so on throughout the catalogue. What sort of an issue is this to present to a free and intelligent people, capable of governing themselves, and claiming the right to choose their own public agents to administer the affairs of a Government of their own creation, and which every motive of interest and patriotism prompts them to uphold? Do not be deceived, gentlemen; this shallow trickery will not avail you; it cannot succeed. You must come out from your hiding places, and avow your principles, and expose them to public scrutiny, or you will be overwhelmed in the result. The people of this country cannot be deceived by any such devices. Even in the midst of the torrent of abuse and complaint against this Administration, they will turn round to its revilers, and ask them—What do you propose, to remedy the evils of which you complain; and what does your candidate for the Presidency propose; and what authority have you to speak for him, after he has refused to speak for himself? Then gentlemen will find that all this talk about the poor man's candidate will not stand the test of the scrutiny and intelligence of the laboring man in the Northern States. I am sure that this class of my constituents would feel themselves insulted by any such humbug; they have too much good sense, and understand Federal treachery too well, sir, to be thus easily deceived; and let any party that does not believe it, make the attempt—I am willing to witness the result. But it is useless to pursue this matter further; for one, I am satisfied what the country must expect, if the Opposition should be successful in their efforts to overthrow

376

this Administration, of which I do not believe there is the least danger; but if, contrary to all reasonable calculations, they succeed, then we must prepare ourselves for another reign of Federal misrule. A National Bank will be chartered, the tariff will be restored and increased, unconstitutional appropriations will follow, and the proceeds of the sales of the public lands will be divided among the States, and the State debts will be assumed, and, to complete the catalogue of mischief

that will ensue, the North and the South will be arrayed against each other upon the subject of Abolition, the effect of which I will not undertake to predict, but the future will show. Now if, in all this, as a humble member of the Democratic party, I am mistaken, is it not true that thousands of the people of this country honestly believe that it is all likely to take place; and if there is any mistake about it, why does not the Whig candidate speak out and remove the impression?

3 0112 061614373

